

COMMITTEE ON LANDS AND BUILDINGS

March 19, 2002

**Aldermen Thibault, Gatsas, Pinard,
DeVries, Garrity**

6:00 PM

**Aldermanic Chambers
City Hall (3rd Floor)**

Chairman Thibault called the meeting to order.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: Aldermen Thibault, Gatsas, Pinard, DeVries, Garrity

Messrs: F. Thomas, D. Eaton, J. McCord, R. Johnson, S. Tellier, R. MacKenzie

Chairman Thibault addressed Item 3 of the agenda:

Communication from Bruce Thomas, Highway Department, regarding a request from Edward Gordon, Trustee of East Side Realty Trust, to waive an easement restriction.

Alderman Pinard asked have there been any communications with this one. I had talked with Citizen's Bank and supposedly there was supposed to be something in there because there will be two banks on the same lot and I am concerned because I live in that area and feel that maybe we should table this for further study until we get something from Mr. Gordon and from Citizen's Bank.

Chairman Thibault replied if you want to ask any questions of Frank Thomas I think he might be able to answer some of your questions and if not, we will table it.

Alderman Pinard asked what is your feeling, Frank, between Citizen's Bank and the other one. I know they were concerned.

Mr. Thomas answered I will be honest that I don't know too much about the development project itself. What is being requested here of this Committee is permission to encroach into an existing utility easement that we have. As far as that request, we do support it. We have granted similar types of requests in the past. The building itself will not encroach into the easement area, but it will be the footings on the building. The building will be on piles from what I understand so the chances of any problems to our existing utility are in the future if we have to do any excavation or repair work on it, it is minimal. The request that is in here before you tonight we support.

Chairman Thibault asked is this a sewer easement or water easement.

Mr. Thomas answered there is both sewer and storm drainage in this extra wide easement. The utility that is the closest to the building is a sanitary sewer.

Chairman Thibault asked and you don't have a problem with that. In other words these people are going to give you the right to get in there if you have to and do whatever?

Mr. Thomas answered no it is the other way around. We do have an easement that restricts any permanent structure in that easement and what they are asking for is to be allowed to encroach into this easement area, I believe up to 7 feet, in order to construct their footings on their building.

Chairman Thibault asked and you have no problem with that.

Mr. Thomas answered no. Again we feel it is only one corner. We still would have the space to get in there and work on the sewer if we ever needed to in the future.

Alderman Gatsas asked is there a reason, Frank, why they couldn't go 7 feet further up.

Mr. Thomas answered I really don't know. I believe that they are kind of restricted in their layout but I really don't know. I would just be guessing.

Alderman Gatsas asked is somebody here from East Side Realty Trust.

Mr. Donald Eaton stated I am from Eaton Partners and we represent St. Mary's Bank.

Ms. Jennifer McCord stated I am with Keach-Nordstrom Associates. I am the engineer on the project.

Alderman Gatsas asked is there a reason why the building couldn't move further up.

Mr. Eaton answered yes. The site is quite restricted in that to the north of the building there is an additional easement, which is a drainage easement owned by an abutter. We did not wish to encroach on that. In addition to that fact, by moving the building north that would reduce the drive aisle lanes that would go to the drive-through to a point where our stacking would be impacted.

Ms. McCord stated this plan we have come up with we have worked very closely with Terry Harlacher of the Planning Department to fit this on the site with the required amount of parking and distances and setbacks to the property lines.

Alderman Pinard asked is this land that you are leasing from MEG.

Mr. Eaton answered the parcel where St. Mary's Bank is going is a land parcel owned by East Side Realty Trust, the Gordon entity. It is part of the shopping center land.

Alderman Pinard asked at the entrance from Hanover Street on is your bank going to be right on that corner.

Mr. Eaton answered it is behind the Shell Station.

Alderman Pinard stated again my concern is congestion of traffic. You are going to wind up with two banks plus a shopping center and we are going to have problems. I would like to table this for further study if I may.

Mr. Eaton replied if I could add this plan has been approved by the Planning Board conditional upon some very minor revisions by staff.

Chairman Thibault stated I have to honor the fact that Alderman Pinard is asking that it be tabled.

Alderman Pinard moved to table this item. Alderman Garrity duly seconded the motion.

Chairman Thibault asked why would we table this if, in fact, the Planning Board has approved it. I guess that is my question. Is there anybody from the Planning Board here? Alderman Pinard what would you like them to explain. Are you talking about traffic situations?

Alderman Pinard replied yes traffic is a key thing and then the leased part of it and you have another bank within 100 feet that has been there forever. My concern is the traffic with two banks side by side. I am not satisfied and I don't think that we have enough information from the Planning Board. I think someone from the Planning Board should have been here to explain this.

Chairman Thibault stated well they are not so I am taking their word, if you will, that Terry Harlacher has worked with them and they are favorable to this. I have no problem with your motion to table this.

Alderman DeVries asked is the entrance into the bank going to be off of the entrance into the East Side Plaza or is it going to be from within the parking lot of the East Side Plaza behind that Sunoco. Where do you physically see the entrance coming in?

Mr. Eaton answered the entrance to the bank site is from the East Side Plaza.

Alderman DeVries asked it is from the parking lot of the East Side Plaza so it really wouldn't be impacting the traffic out on the main road.

Mr. Eaton answered not it wouldn't and a traffic study had been prepared and provided to the Planning Board as part of our approval process.

Alderman DeVries asked when was your approval from the Planning Board. Was that last fall?

Mr. Eaton answered on September 20.

Chairman Thibault stated Alderman Pinard let me just state that the thing for this Committee to vote on tonight is asking for an encroachment on City land. The other problems, I think, could come back at any time on any committee or through the Board if you have a concern. The only thing that we should be looking at here is the encroachment on City land. I will hold back on your decision to table and let us decide on the encroachment issue only. You will have plenty of time to bring your issues up.

Alderman Garrity asked would it be appropriate to recommend this to the Traffic and Public Safety Committee.

Chairman Thibault answered again I think that the only thing we are asking here is for encroachment on City land. That can go to any Committee you want it to go to to have all of these things checked out.

Alderman Garrity asked where would that motion come from, this Committee or the full Board.

Chairman Thibault answered I think at the Board you could ask that it go to whatever Committee you want it to go to.

Deputy Clerk Johnson stated I would like to speak to that question. Basically my understanding is the question before this Committee obviously is relative to the easement. The City has an easement and they are asking for release or encroachment onto the easement and that is the issue before this Committee. The traffic issues and the development issues in terms of that building are not a Board of Mayor and Aldermen decision. That is a Planning Board issue and that is where it needs to be addressed. It is not something that will go before the Traffic Committee unless the Planning Board asks for the Traffic Committee to review it. That is really where you want to focus your attention for traffic issues and those kinds of things on any development project that comes forward.

Chairman Thibault asked so it could go to the Planning Board.

Deputy Clerk Johnson answered you could request the Planning Board to relook at the traffic issue certainly. I don't know what the status of the project is at the Planning Board level.

Alderman Pinard withdrew his motion to table. Alderman Garrity withdrew his second.

On motion of Alderman Pinard, duly seconded by Alderman DeVries it was voted to approve a request to waive an easement restriction from Edward Gordon, Trustee of East Side Realty Trust.

Alderman DeVries stated I am sure they had a traffic study done when it was in front of the Planning Board and that they met all of the needs of the Planning Board.

Mr. Eaton replied that is correct.

Chairman Thibault addressed Item 4 of the agenda:

Update on city owned properties:

a) general update from Clerk

Deputy Clerk Johnson stated the Clerk has distributed to the Committee a few handouts. Basically the Committee had asked the Clerk's office to get a listing of city-owned property, which we had done. We worked with the Assessor's Office and they helped us put that together. In the process of that we had talked to the Committee at its last meeting and said that we would go back and start reviewing these properties to try and put some semblance of order into the listing. What I have given you today is the first run against the list. What the Clerk's Office did was send a letter out to all of the departments that were listed as owning or belonging to certain properties if you will and asked them to provide the Clerk's Office certain information. We had given them a deadline of April 1 to report back so that we could provide the information to the Committee. In the meantime, what we also did was we got together with various departments, including Parks & Recreation, Assessors, we had Highway, Solicitor's and a couple of others. Anyway, we got all of the major players together in one room. The Tax Collector was definitely one of those who was sitting in on that. We looked at what information we have or what information could we try because what happens is as time goes on we keep getting the same requests for the same parcels of property and then we have to go back and do the research all over again or we have some listings of properties but we have incomplete information and it doesn't get carried from year to year. Now that we have a system that we can plug it into, we thought that if we could categorize properties in some way, manner, shape or form all city-owned properties, that would give us a better cue. So we threw some ideas around the table and we are going to get back together in a week or so and try to put some of that together. I have given you a sample of a card as well. It is

a property record card. That is actually an Assessor's record and some of the records in the transfer of information recently may not be quite right, especially in terms of zoning districts because the zoning map changes have not been made to the system as I understand it. On that card if you notice there are two sections that I have written an A and a B in. A is a note section that we can actually stick some general comments in like a deed restriction if it was an Amoskeag property or something like that. Down in the lower right hand section there is an item marked B and that is one that if we put codes with it we could identify the department and perhaps whether it was land banked for a specific purpose. For instance, we might have an agreement with EPA to be holding something aside for wetlands or we may want to hold it because we want to sell it to the State for mitigation on a major access way to the Airport or something like that. There are various reasons that the Board might want to hold property and not dispense with it or that you just never want to dispose of it because it is part of a street or some other issue. We are trying to develop a coding system that then can be placed onto these property record cards so that if we wanted more detail we could go to the card and get more back-up information. In the meantime, what I have done is taken what information we have gathered and started plugging that in on our Excel spreadsheet, if you will, that I have given you that lists all of the properties. Some of those properties actually aren't City properties, they are the Housing Authority's or somebody else's and we will clean that up a little more. We have actually identified a lot of stuff already. From that process we started looking at some specific properties that the Tax Collector recently took that are not on that list as of yet but will go on. They haven't been recorded on the list yet. There are some that it is felt by the majority of staff that did meet that can be disposed of now and there is no reason for the City to be holding them and they could be auctioned off and placed back on the tax roles. Those would all be subject to what we term a 30-day notice if it is taken by Tax Collector deed. By law she has to give them 30 days to come back and repurchase the property from the City subject to certain conditions and that would be basically to pay all taxes and interest due as of that date. We also would need to get the appraisal or the market value from the Assessors, the current market values, and set those fees as well by Ordinance. We do have some properties tonight that we are prepared to ask you to work on. There is one on the Tax Collector's list that I think we are going to ask you to hold based on discussion with staff. I guess from here I would like to move on to Item B first because we do have specific requests that have come in to the Committee.

b) Crystal Lake Preservation request

Deputy Clerk Johnson stated this is a request of certain City owned land, which we do in fact own all of these lots and they are in that Crystal Lake area. I don't know if Ron Johnson has any information for you this evening but he was going to follow-up with the State because these are properties that are wetlands. They aren't developable but rather than selling or giving them away it was thought that perhaps the State would have an interest in mitigation. For the Airport access way they have to purchase certain wetlands and hold them aside in perpetuity. It is not an area, obviously, that the City would want

to see developed and everybody is in agreement with that. So even if the City would want to hold it or you would want to allow it to be sold for that type of a purpose...Ron is here.

Mr. Johnson stated as Carol mentioned I didn't have a chance to check with the State at this point. We just met yesterday morning but I brought along a map that we worked with the Planning Department on two years ago for that section of Manchester where we were in need of additional parkland. I can present the map. Those particular lots are adjacent to Crystal Lake. They are located just behind Demers Garden Center at the dead end of several streets. I can just bring up the map so you can take a look at those. They were, I believe, tax deeded lots. They are all in wetland areas so they are undevelopable. As Carol mentioned, in addition to probably the Airport access way and the widening of Interstate 93, the State DOT needs to do some wetland mitigation so these particular lots could be used for mitigation purposes. We would probably check to see if the State has to acquire some property. It might be a chance for the City to sell these lots to the State, which has to then put them in perpetuity for wetland conservation and then any funds that might come forward could possibly be used for purchase of other parkland. If you would like, I can just bring the map up to show you the location.

Ron Johnson showed the Committee members the property in question.

Alderman Pinard stated LaMontagne is going to start building near that farm area right.

Mr. Johnson replied yes right here.

Deputy Clerk Johnson stated it was tax deeded property and I would just add that it would have to go back to the general fund and then be appropriated for whatever. It is not Parks money.

Alderman Pinard asked how much does DOT have to do...I-93 is way up and a long way from that. You also mentioned the Airport.

Mr. Johnson answered they are widening I-93.

Alderman Pinard stated well it is a long way from Crystal Lake.

Alderman DeVries responded I can explain. The Crystal Lake Preservation Association has been attempting to receive some money from I-93 as Ron Johnson explained. They are widening that and looking for the wetland mitigation. They have identified not only these particular lots, but a sequence of lots that will provide additional protection in the vicinity of Crystal Lake. They probably will know the end of May whether or not they have been chosen to receive the funding for the purchase of these lots. It is in question

but they are in the final cut, per say. They have been identified as one of the prime projects that DOT would like to bring forward.

Alderman Pinard asked with the impact of LaMontagne, the Airport, the widening of I-93...

Chairman Thibault interjected aren't they going to have to meet all of the Federal or State standards before they can do anything there.

Alderman Gatsas asked on mitigation they can go anyplace they want and I think that you will see in the next few days that the site they have chosen is right on the hair of this Board's neck.

Chairman Thibault answered what does that mean.

Alderman DeVries replied he knows something up at the State level that we don't know.

Chairman Thibault asked is that something that you want to share with us.

Alderman Gatsas answered I think it will be made public soon.

Deputy Clerk Johnson stated if I could back to the issue of these lots, basically they are lots that the City would want to retain in perpetuity one way or the other. They are tax deeded. You can't sell them other than by public auction unless you have just cause. Obviously if you are selling them to the State for mitigation to put them in perpetuity that is fine. If you are selling them to a private entity, such as the Crystal Lake Preservation Association or donating them in this instance, I am not sure what they are asking for, but then in essence you are giving it to somebody who intends to sell it to somebody and I am not sure that that is going to meet the just cause of State law. That would have to be looked at by the Solicitor. In either case, in the question of preserving the lots, the City agrees that they should be preserved. Certainly if the City has an opportunity to sell them and make sure they are still preserved and let the State hold them then that is something that the City may want to consider and it is a question of do you want to proceed with attempting to speak with the State directly, do you want to proceed with having the Solicitor review whether you could give them to somebody who is going to sell them off and the City is not going to get the money for it. I don't know what that balance becomes but that is something that the Committee would need to recommend to the Board in either case. The State may not even want these lots and if that is the case then I think the City's answer to the Association would be that they want to hold them and an order of the Board would take place for that.

Chairman Thibault stated the reason for this is that I had asked the City Clerk to compile a list of all City land that could, in fact, be sold to put on the tax roles and that is why this is here. Carol if I hear you right maybe this is something that we should have the State decide or let us know where they are at with this thing.

Deputy Clerk Johnson stated the first thing is to find out whether or not the State has any interest in the parcels if the City wants to sell them but if you want to give them to somebody else to sell then that is something you need the Solicitor to look at first. I guess that is the first question, whether or not you would want to give up that opportunity for the City taxpayers and have it go to them. That is a question for the Board and that is a policy issue.

Chairman Thibault stated we need to get the State's input before we take any action in this Committee.

Alderman DeVries asked I am wondering if it might make more sense to table it at this point in time and look to see what the judgement is of the DOT/EPA decision on the project because that is the involvement at the State.

On motion of Alderman DeVries, duly seconded by Alderman Pinard it was voted to table this item pending clarification from the State.

c) Tax Collector/disposals subject to 30 day notice

Deputy Clerk Johnson stated there are a few properties that she had submitted and we have some additions to that as well. I guess right now...she has submitted a list that states Sheffield Road, 218 Pine Street, 107 Massabesic, 450 Merrimack Street and a parcel on Brown Avenue, 628 Hanover Street, 258 Salmon Street and 202 Calef Road. It is all in a memo with attachments of reports. The 628 Hanover Street property, both the Parks Department and the Planning Department have requested be held so I guess that one I would ask for no action at this time and that it be held until the next meeting when we can converse more. There is a potential interest by Water Works or by the Airport regarding the Sheffield Road and Brown Avenue areas. Brown Avenue from my understanding is a parcel near the river and the Sheffield Road is obviously in the Airport section so I have asked the Airport to review the Sheffield Road area. If you wanted to have a motion to recommend that they be sent to auction subject to review by the staff and if there is a department that has an interest in those items it would come back to the Committee and not be forwarded on to the Board for auction you could do that and set them as being to public auction subject to the 30 day notice and an estimated value to be set by the Board of Assessors as a minimum bid.

Alderman Gatsas stated I think it is imperative that any department who is going to want to lay claim to these properties that they identify why.

Deputy Clerk Johnson replied what would happen as part of this normal process is that we would come back with a report that says, for instance, on Brown Avenue if it is on the riverbank and there is some EPA involvement or something we might come back and say this is to report that we have been given by this department that says it should be reserved and why. There are specific reasons why some of these...in the case of the Airport they would purchase the property and it wouldn't be something that the City would give them so you would have to still set your market value on that but there would be just cause in that instance perhaps to sell it to the Airport as being a future interest of the Airport, which works in conjunction with the City obviously but yes that would be part of the report. On 258 Salmon Street and 202 Calef Road, a condo, those are items that have already been looked at pretty much and it has been determined that they should go out to auction and they are not anything that the City is going to want to keep.

Chairman Thibault asked so what is the motion.

On motion of Alderman DeVries, duly seconded by Alderman Pinard it was voted to refer the properties to auction with the exception of 628 Hanover Street, and authorize that they be auctioned subject to departmental review and satisfaction of the statutory 30 day notice for redemption by the prior owners and subject to the Board of Assessors to give an opinion of value with a minimum bid to be accepted.

d) Bill Dumont request to purchase Lot #79 and half of Lot #80

Deputy Clerk Johnson stated the gentleman is asking to purchase back a property because he didn't pay the taxes. The parcel that he is asking for is actually on Groveland Avenue and is Map 492, Lots 5 and 6. I have reviewed those today with several departments. If you take the lots combined they constitute a 60' frontage by approximately 97' deep. We researched the history on them. It is actually a buildable lot so it is our opinion that that should be sent out to auction. This is the piece between Delisle's property. Delisle owns on either side of it. The gentleman who is requesting it is his son. He had purchased it many years ago although he never lived there. There is nothing on it. It is vacant land. He lives in Weare. He is asking to buy it back. We are presuming that he wants to give it to his father or something so he can build there but it is a buildable lot. He hasn't paid the taxes on it since 1990. The recommendation of staff is to allow that to go to auction and decline the request.

Alderman Pinard asked so Mr. Delisle wouldn't be able to purchase the property.

Deputy Clerk Johnson answered Mr. Delisle would be able to purchase the property as much as anybody else in the City. In order to sell it to an abutter we would have to have a justifiable reason under State law and the staff does not see any reason why it shouldn't go out to auction. It is a buildable lot and anybody should be allowed to purchase it.

On motion of Alderman Garrity, duly seconded by Alderman Pinard, it was voted to deny the request and have this property go to public auction.

Deputy Clerk Johnson stated in addition to that, in the course of reviewing that there is another lot on the same street, Groveland Avenue, Lot 20, which is at the other end of the street and I don't believe...I don't know if it shows up on your map but I have another map I can show you. This is the park and this is the entrance to the park.

Alderman Pinard asked are those all 60' x 100' lots.

Deputy Clerk Johnson answered no they are smaller than that. They use it as an access way to get through to the park and Parks is asking to have that assigned to them.

Alderman Gatsas asked what park is that.

Deputy Clerk Johnson answered Youngsville Park.

Chairman Thibault asked so what should we do with that.

Deputy Clerk Johnson answered we are going to suggest that you recommend it as parkland.

Alderman Gatsas asked is it a buildable lot.

Deputy Clerk Johnson answered I don't know.

Alderman Gatsas asked can we find that out.

Deputy Clerk Johnson answered yes.

Alderman Gatsas stated I just have a problem that because somebody is using it as a cut way and it is a buildable lot that we are just saying the City owns it.

Chairman Thibault asked if we, in fact, let go of this land how would they get into that park or is that the only access.

Deputy Clerk Johnson asked Ron Johnson to answer.

Mr. Johnson asked is this Lot 20 we are talking about. I think it has been used by the neighborhood and Alderman Pinard might know a little bit more because that is right in his backyard area. I think it has been an informal access that leads right to the tennis courts at Youngsville Park. The main entrance is from Candia Road but there are no

sidewalks on Candia Road so a lot of people on Groveland walk down and cut through this access to get to the park.

Chairman Thibault stated Alderman Gatsas' problem is that if it is a buildable lot maybe we should leave it open if there is another access to the park. Do you want to table this and have it researched?

Alderman Pinard asked is that going to be strictly for walking. You are not going to make it so a car can drive up there are you?

Mr. Johnson answered no. It has always been used by the neighborhood just as a pedestrian walk through and it will continue to be that.

Alderman Pinard replied I will go along with it as long as it is not passable with cars. If it is good enough for cars then it is good enough to be a buildable lot.

On motion of Alderman Pinard, duly seconded by Alderman DeVries, it was voted to table this item pending further information.

e) Remigio Arce request to purchase Map 459/Lot 14A

Deputy Clerk Johnson stated it turns out that it is actually Lot 1A that the gentleman is interested in. When we researched it, it is a paved turn around. It is part of a street so obviously the motion would be to deny the request.

On motion of Alderman Garrity, duly seconded by Alderman Pinard, it was voted to deny this request.

f) Brian & Leslie Duplessis request to purchase Map 441, Lot 9A

Deputy Clerk Johnson stated this item is a request to purchase Map 441, Lot 9A by an abutter. When we reviewed this parcel, I actually have another map for you to see, there were two other parcels that the City owns that are contiguous to it and there are no streets.

Deputy Clerk Johnson showed the Committee members the map. It is felt by the staff that all three parcels should be sold together at auction.

Alderman Sysyn asked has Parks & Recreation viewed this.

Deputy Clerk Johnson answered yes Parks & Recreation has looked at this. This is the lot requested to be purchased.

Chairman Thibault asked Mr. Tellier to come up and give some information on the land.

Mr. Tellier stated I toured the site this afternoon. It is a low land area. It doesn't appear wet at this time, but nothing is wet at this time. It is depressed as far as the topography area. These are paper streets so they do not exist. They are not paved. They are not even through ways. It directly abuts the residential houses on Westland and a large commercial building owned by Velcro on the other side. They have an industrial 8' fence that runs along the border of their property. If it were the City's wishes to dispose of that in one block or to the highest bidder, that is fine.

Chairman Thibault asked is that west of Velcro or is it south of Velcro.

Mr. Tellier answered south. Westland is a street that comes off of Brown Avenue. When you cross the Queen City Bridge and take a right on Brown Avenue past the housing project, past Velcro there are a couple of dead end streets and then you would take a right on Westland going down the hill. Topography is really low.

Alderman Garrity asked square footage wise, all three lots combined, how much is that.

Mr. Tellier answered I didn't combine them all. It is a good sized parcel of property but I don't know what it is. I didn't combine them.

Alderman Garrity asked when you go down Westland from Brown Avenue it is on the right hand side.

Mr. Tellier answered correct. It is right behind 193 to 195 is a duplex going down the hill and 199 is a two-story flat roof Colonial style building so it is right behind at the bottom of the hill. That is the last building on the right and then you get to the end of the street, which is the Boston & Maine railroad corridor as well. It is bordered by the street and then the railroad corridor and then the largest area frontage is bordered by Velcro.

Alderman Garrity asked so do you get access to the land from the dead end on Westland.

Mr. Tellier answered not really, no. It is all private land with the exception of the paper streets that are undeveloped. Those are public but they have never been developed.

Chairman Thibault asked so how would you access the land.

Mr. Tellier answered just through those paper streets that by rights of use over time they look like the yards of the abutting homes.

Alderman Gatsas asked collectively out of all of the parcels that are there and there are three parcels, what is the total acreage.

Mr. Tellier answered I don't have that. I can get that for you. It may be upwards of an acre.

Alderman Gatsas asked zoned R-2.

Mr. Tellier answered I don't know the zoning. I think it is residential though.

Deputy Clerk Johnson stated it was R-2 before and as far as we know there were no changes in that location but we are not sure. We haven't had a chance to check that.

Chairman Thibault asked, Mr. MacKenzie, do you know what this is zoned.

Mr. MacKenzie answered I hesitate because the zoning line goes right near but not along the Velcro line so it is possible that...I would have to check the zoning maps in detail. You can see the Velcro property line is here but I know the zoning line does not exactly jive with the Velcro property so I would like to check...I am presuming that these are R-2 lots but I can't say right off the bat because it is close.

Deputy Clerk Johnson asked do you want us to bring this back with more information for the three lots together.

On motion of Alderman Garrity, duly seconded by Alderman DeVries it was voted to deny this request.

Chairman Thibault addressed Item 5 of the agenda:

Reports from City Solicitor and Assessors regarding Bridge Street subdivision application submitted by CLD, if available.

Deputy Clerk Johnson stated we did review this with staff. That section is a City-owned property, however, there was representation at some public hearings that were held when the State was involved where it was indicated that a green buffer would be left in that location. It is a major area and Parks and Planning had both recommended that this not be disposed of.

On motion of Alderman DeVries, duly seconded by Alderman Pinard, it was voted to deny the request to acquire the property.

TABLED ITEM

6. Communication from Lucille Stevens, Chairman of the Concerned Taxpayers of Manchester, NH seeking information regarding the current financial status of a building in the Millyard, which houses the FIRST Program.
(Tabled 8/7/01.)

Deputy Clerk Johnson stated I provided you the minutes of the discussion of the meeting when this was tabled.

Chairman Thibault stated I would hope having been on this Committee last year and this came up several times and I know it is a major concern of some people and I wonder if we could look into this and get some resolution.

Deputy Clerk Johnson replied you have all of the documents. I will resubmit them to this Committee.

This item remained on the table.

NEW BUSINESS

64 Well Street – request to release easements

Deputy Clerk Johnson stated we have an item where a woman came into our office about four weeks ago and has been trying to work this out. It is a request to release drainage easements at 64 Wells Street. The Highway Department has indicated that the first two easements could be released and the last one they would like to maintain.

Mr. Thomas stated these are old drainage easements that criss-cross the Youngsville area where this house is. Quite frankly, they have never been utilized and over a period of time a house, in this case, is actually built into this drainage easement. Now it is not an easement that was officially turned over to the City per say but it was an easement that was shown on various development plans. We have reviewed it and we do not have a problem. We actually went out and took a look at the area as far as drainage. We have no utility pipes in. We have no swails in. We really don't have anything for the conveyance of drainage in that area so we definitely support the request that has been made.

On motion of Alderman Pinard, duly seconded by Alderman Garrity, it was voted to approve release of two easements as recommended by the Highway Department.

There being no further business, on motion of Alderman Garrity, duly seconded by Alderman Pinard, it was voted to adjourn.

A True Record. Attest.

Clerk of Committee